Remarks

This paper is in response to the Office Action dated May 11, 2006. Claims 2, 5-9, and 16-18 have been amended and claims 1 and 11-15 have been canceled without prejudice. New claims 20-26 have been added. Claims 2-10 and 16-26 are currently pending. Applicant respectfully traverses the rejected claims. Reexamination and reconsideration are respectfully requested.

Claims 11-15 were objected to. Applicant has canceled these claims without prejudice to further prosecute these claims and their subject matter. Claim 18 has been amended to replace the term "member" with "membrane" a requested by the Examiner.

Claims 16-17 have been amended to recite "suspension arm" instead of "support arm", to be consistent with the specification and not in response to any rejection of the claims.

Applicant thanks the Examiner for indicating the claims 7-8, 10, and 15 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Applicant has rewritten claims 7 and 8 in independent form. Claim 10 depends from claim 7.

Claims 1-6, 9, 11-14 and 16-18 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as unpatentable over Hipwell et al. (US. 2003/0030942 A1). Applicant does not concede that the Examiner's interpretation of US 2003/0030942 A1) is proper. Applicant also does not concede that US 2003/0030942 A1 is entitled to the filing date of provisional application number 60/311,724. However, to expedite prosecution, applicant has canceled independent claims 1 and 11 without prejudice, and amended independent claim 16. Applicant reserves the right to further prosecute these claims as originally filed.

Claims 2, 5-6, and 9 have been amended to depend from claim 7, which was indicated as allowable if rewritten in independent form. Claims 3-4 depend from claim 2. Claims 11-14 have been canceled without prejudice.

Claim 16 as been amended to recite in part ". . . wherein at least a portion of the membrane is configured to deflect into the cavity when a suitable force is applied to the read/write head." Applicant respectfully submits that the Examiner's citations to Hipwell et al do not describe or suggest the subject matter recited in claim 16. Accordingly, for at least the

above reason, applicant respectfully submits that the rejection of claim 16 and its dependent claims 17-18 should be withdrawn.

For at least the above reasons, applicant respectfully submits that the rejection of claims 2-6, 9, and 16-18 should be withdrawn.

New claims 19-26 have been added. Support for these claims may be found throughout the specification and Figures. It is believed that no new matter has been entered. Examination of these new claims is respectfully requested.

The Office Action included various comments concerning the art and the non-patentability of certain claims. The discussion above has directly addressed some of the Examiner's comments and any of the Examiner's comments regarding the art and the claims not specifically discussed above are deemed moot at this time in view of this response.

Applicant respectfully submits that the pending claims are in condition for allowance.

Reexamination and reconsideration are respectfully requested. If, for any reason, the application is not in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to discuss the steps necessary to place the application into condition for allowance

Respectfully submitted,

Alan S. Raynes

Reg. No. 39,809

KONRAD RAYNES & VICTOR, LLP

315 South Beverly Drive, Suite 210

Beverly Hills, CA 90212

Customer No. 24033

Dated: Aug. // , 2006

(310) 556-7983 (tele general)

(310) 871-8448 (tele direct)

(310) 556-7984 (facsimile)

Certificate of Mailing

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service with sufficient postage as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: Mail Stop Amendment, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 on Aug. //, 2006.

Alan S Daynes Reg No 30 800

Aug. (1

(Date)